REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended by this Response. Claims 1-27 are currently pending in this application and are at issue.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has objected to claims 11-13, 16 and 25-27 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for this notification. However, in view of the amendments made herein, Applicants do not believe it necessary to rewrite these claims in independent form.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 7, 9, 14, 21 and 23 stand rejected under § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,270,987 to Kaku et al. ("Kaku") in view of an article by Shi, Thornton and Hesselink entitled "A Nano-aperture with 1000x Power Throughput Enhancement for Very Small Aperture Laser System (VSAL)" ("Shi"). Additionally, claims 2-6, 8, 10, 15, 17-20, 22 and 24 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Kaku in view of Shi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,859,814 to Kino et al. ("Kino"). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants wish to thank Examiners Giesy and Young for granting a phone interview with the undersigned on March 30, 2005. The substance of the discussion is set forth below as indicated.

During the interview, <u>Kaku</u>, as well as U.S. Patent No. 5,070,487 to Watson et al. ("<u>Watson</u>"), were specifically discussed. <u>Kaku</u> illustrates a magneto-optical recording device where the optical and magnetic heads are disposed on opposite sides of the recording medium. It was further discussed that <u>Watson</u> shows a magneto-optic recording system having a light source illuminating on a recording medium, with the light source disposed next to a magnetic pole.

The claim amendments made herein were agreed upon during the phone interview as overcoming the Examiner's rejections. Specifically, none of the prior art shows or teaches a C-aperture structure disposed adjacent or about at least two edges of a magnetic pole. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome, and respectfully request withdrawal thereof.

Amendments to the specification have been made to place the specification in conformity with the claims. No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

For at least the above-identified reasons, Applicants submit that pending claims 1-27 are allowable over the prior art of record. Allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

It is believed that this Response requires no fee. However, if a fee is required for any reason, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-4553 the necessary amount.

// // //

//

If any matters remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by phone to expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4-6-05

Bryan H. Opalko

Registration No. 40,751

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

One Oxford Centre

301 Grant Street, 20th Floor

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

ph: (412) 562-1893 fx: (412) 562-1041

e-mail: opalkobh@bipc.com

Attorney for Applicant(s)